Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Costa Rica thanks you for all your efforts, and those of your distinguished team, for presenting us with this working document. We recognize some progress, as well as some setbacks. Let me offer some specific comments on the text:

The humanitarian initiative, as reflected in preambular paragraph 2, has been weakened. My delegation cannot accept the new version of preambular paragraph 2 and requests we return to the text of the first draft.

For Costa Rica, it is essential to maintain and strengthen the humanitarian language. I will recall that 33 Heads of State and Government of Latin America and the Caribbean endorsed the Austrian Pledge in January of this year. The three humanitarian conferences in Oslo, Nayarit and Vienna, as well as the factual evidence, must be reflected in the final document. For my country and my region, reflecting this language is an imperative, not an option.

The new paragraph 4 is an excellent addition and we support it in its entirety.

The new Paragraph 5 qualifies the progress on disarmament since the 2010 Review Conference as “substantive.” Costa Rica considers that this is not the case. We request that the word “substantive” be deleted and that we return to the adjective "some" of the first draft.

Moreover, in the fifth paragraph, we noticed the adjective "agreed timelines" has been deleted. We request to return back to its previous wording.

We note that operative paragraph 7 has been redrafted and no longer equates effective measures to unilateral or bilateral actions. However, it included a reference to "in the view of many states," which weakens the text; therefore we request its elimination.

**On the operational side allow me to highlight the following points:**

In operative paragraph 3, we note that the level of demand on nuclear weapon-possessing States by this Review Conference has decreased. From "calls upon", we have moved to "encourages". That is not enough. In paragraphs 3, 6, and 8 must use "urge" rather than motivate or call upon. Furthermore, we note that the reference to "including non-strategic nuclear weapons" was removed, and it should return to the text.

Regarding operative paragraph 4, let me reiterate that the development of new nuclear weapons is contrary to the letter and spirit of the treaty. This paragraph should be revised and be in accordance with treaty obligations.

In operative paragraph 5, we appreciate the removal of the notion of *first use* and that this paragraph only refers to security doctrines. However, the paragraph must be clear in stating that the only way to avoid risks is through their complete prohibition and elimination. This must be reflected in the text.

From operative paragraph 6 stem a number of concerns for us. First, we consider that the initial sentence of this paragraph dilutes the commitment to address the risks associated to nuclear weapons and, in all honesty, we do not understand what it means when it speaks of "greater
than Many states parties previously understood”. Assuming it is not the same as understanding, either in English and in Spanish. We thus respectfully request for this paragraph to be revised.

We reiterate our support to operative paragraph 7 on de-alerting. However, we request the phrase “IN THE VIEW OF MANY STATES PARTIES” be deleted, as it weakens the strength of this measure that does indeed lead to increased international stability and security.

Regarding operative paragraph 15, it concerns us that the moratorium on the production of fissile material was eliminated. This is inconsistent with the Plan of Action of 2010 and should again be reflected in the text.

We appreciate the explicit reference to the International Atomic Energy Agency on verification, which was made in paragraph 16.

In the operative paragraph 17, we request to return to the language of the first version, as “many” is not the same as “majority.” We also request to delete the new sentence added at the end of this paragraph, which specifically says "a phased process of interlocking and mutually-reinforcing steps" as it refers to "building blocks". At this point, we insist on the need to include that there is indeed a legal gap for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

In operative paragraph 18, we welcome the inclusion of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, but we wish to reiterate our desire for an explicit inclusion of the International Committee of the Red Cross. Moreover, we insist on maintaining the references to Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is unacceptable that this Review Conference does not explicitly mention, as it did in the first draft, these unfortunate events and experiences of those who experienced the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons in the flesh.

Thank you.